

ference last Saturday. Neither, surprisingly, were Berlin and West Germany, two traditional Soviet concerns, introduced into the Big Three agenda.

Official American sources also are said to be impressed with the way the Soviet's European satellites have been "clearing the decks of unnecessary harassments" during the past few months in an obvious attempt to improve their relations with the West.

Bulgaria's Foreign Minister Ivan Bashev reemphasized this impression when he saw Rusk today. He, like his Czech counterpart last week, put out a feeler that the satellites, as well as the Soviet Union itself, are interested in buying American wheat to help out this year's poor harvest.

Note also was made here that settlement of back debts—a major barrier to U.S. trade with the satellites—now has been worked out with Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria and is in the process of being worked out with Czechoslovakia.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 30, 1963]
RUSSIAN WHEAT DEAL HOLDS SURPLUS BENEFIT, SOME PERIL

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—Even before the test ban treaty was signed, it was clear what the next step in good relations with Russia was going to be. Trade was certain to follow diplomacy. And it is. Russia has turned up with at least a partial answer to our No. 1 farm problem—what to do with our perennial wheat surplus?

This is a particularly pressing problem this year, farm spending standing as an obstacle in the way of a tax cut, the wheatgrowers having voted down the Kennedy administration's plan to limit production, the United States needing more export income, and U.S. wheat exports needing subsidies Washington can no longer afford to pay. Russia's answer to this ominous array of problems is that she wants to buy some of our surplus wheat—for cash.

This proposition follows on the heels of Russia's purchase of wheat in Canada, which strengthened grain prices and shipping rates all over the world.

Like it or not, the question is not whether the United States is going to do more business with Russia, but on what basis—beginning with the basis on which we let her ease our wheat problem. Russia's wheat-buying binge is producing one of those political switches for which American history is famous.

The unions are suspicious of any trade dealings with Russia, while the conservative-farming belt will obviously welcome it. In all probability, business—worried about the dollar, hoping for a tax cut but fearful of farm spending as an obstacle—will welcome it, too. In any case, legislation will be needed, and so the question becomes one of national policy.

The way Russia played her hand in Canada suggests guidelines and peril points. The Canadian Government has been so worried about its financial situation in general, and its wheat surplus in particular, that it apparently did not dare stop to ask any questions (especially as the present opposition has its political base in the western wheat provinces). But hungry though the United States is for wheat customers, any new trade deal with Russia is certain to be subjected to searching scrutiny and debate.

Before Russia cleaned out the Canadian wheat surplus, no outsider knew how much she was short for her own domestic requirements; and no one knows even yet. All that anyone knows is that some of the wheat she bought will be resold to Cuba; that China, which needs Canadian wheat and has been buying a great deal of it, is temporary frozen

out of the Canadian market; and that Russia's satellites in Eastern Europe will share a ration with Cuba.

Economically, it's adding up to a bailout for Canada, and to a bonanza for the grain and shipping markets. But, politically, it looks more like a coup for Russia. In terms of guidelines and period points for national policy, the United States needs the bailout and wants the bonanza, and there's a very specific reason why we should be able to trade it out for ourselves without inviting Russia to score another political coup at our expense.

The reason is that the entire European land mass seems to have suffered a wheat crop failure this year, while nature has been bountiful on this side of the Atlantic. Theorizing apart, no one knows how severe the failure may have been within Russia herself; how much of a reserve she may have; or how much of her present purchases are really scheduled not for her own internal use but instead for resale throughout free Europe and for rationing and political bribery among satellites.

We don't need Russia to get in between us and our allies and friends in free Europe, and to resell our premium commodities to them for their good money when they are our creditors. It is to the mutual interest of all in the Atlantic community for us to earn more by direct sales to Europe. No doubt about it, free Europe needs wheat, and it has the money to pay for it. True, Russia will offer to pay us in gold, which we badly need, but so will Europe.

The satellites need our wheat even more, and this is a time for us to trade out a tangible political return on all that we have been giving to Poland and to Yugoslavia, as well as for us to look for our own back in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 23, 1963]
UNITED STATES SEES WHEAT EXCESS BELOW EARLIER ESTIMATE

(By William M. Blair)

HANNIBAL, Mo., September 22.—Early estimates of winter wheat plantings now underway in the Midwest indicate that overplanting may be less than had been feared after farmers rejected a new production-control program earlier this year.

If this is borne out, Federal officials said today, the anticipated runaway wheat situation may not develop, although a sizable increase in surplus output is still expected.

The officials believe that wheat producers, fearful of a predicted sharp drop in prices and the loss of a Federal price guarantee, will plant 5 million fewer acres than had been expected. This would represent half the 10 million acres of overplanting predicted when farmers turned down the administration's control plan in a national referendum last May.

The decreases would mean that instead of a harvest of as much as 1.5 billion bushels, the crop may be closer to 1.2 to 1.3 billion bushels.

Nevertheless, there would still be a surplus of 200 million bushels.

This year's wheat crop was about 1,100 million bushels, 7 percent below the 1957-61 average but still 4-percent above.

Winter wheat, which makes up the bulk of the wheat crop, is going into the ground now for harvest next spring.

Overplanting is the amount of wheat sown above Federal allotments made to producers. By staying within these allotments farmers are guaranteed a Federal price support of \$1.25 a bushel, beginning next year. There is no price guarantee for producers who do not stay within their acreage allotments.

When farmers rejected the control plan, the Federal allotment restrictions remained in farm law but the price support dropped

from \$2 a bushel to \$1.25. The control program would have guaranteed \$2 a bushel.

The prospects of a \$1.25-a-bushel support was expected to produce heavy overplanting as farmers fought to maintain income. The overall income loss to wheat producers has been figured at about \$700 million for next year.

AMENDMENT'S INFLUENCE

An amendment to the wheat law appears to be a major factor in slowing down overplanting. It was enacted by Congress in 1958 and is named for former Representative Victor L. Anfuso of Brooklyn, now a State judge.

The Anfuso amendment provides that a farmer who overplants his Federal allotment will lose history should he decide to get back under the Government program in later years. Loss of history means that he would lose a percentage of allowable or allotted acres. This loss could run as high as 8 percent of the acres allotted to wheat.

In brief, the Government would cut a farmer's allotment if he overplanted this year and stayed out of the Federal program, then decided that next year he wanted to get back in.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman heard pleas for suspension of the amendment during a tour of the Midwest last week. However, he was adamant about retaining it.

To suspend it, he said, would not be fair to farmers who stayed within their acreage restrictions.

A House agriculture subcommittee has supported Mr. Freeman's stand.

The Secretary took another vote last night of farmers on the question of selling surplus wheat to the Soviet Union. The result was 3 to 1 in favor of such sales if the Russians paid in dollars.

The show of hands at a packed meeting in the Hannibal High School, however, represented about one-fourth of the 1,500 persons.

RUSSIANS SALES CAUTIONED

Mr. Freeman, who sounded out sentiment in Iowa, Kansas, Illinois, and Missouri, too, again cautioned that any decision to sell surplus foodstuffs to Russia would be made only after careful study.

He told the farmers they should not rely on stronger farm wheat prices to result from Canada's decision to sell \$500 million worth of wheat and flour to Russia.

Mr. Freeman's visit here was another in the series of 13 "report and review" sessions he is holding throughout the country to answer farmers' questions and listen to their problems.

Overplanting of wheat appears much greater in the western end of the Great Plains States where wheat ranches run to sections of 640 acres. In the central and eastern areas, where farms are smaller, officials report that producers seem to be staying within their Federal allotments.

It was noted, however, that the western wheat men traditionally overplant because the weather is a risk in the area.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1963]
HUGE WHEAT SALE CLOSED IN CANADA—SOVIET TO PAY HALF A BILLION FOR 198 MILLION BUSHELS—CUBA TO GET PART

(By Raymond Daniell)

OTTAWA, September 16.—Canada closed an agreement today to sell the Soviet Union nearly \$500 million worth of wheat, the largest sale of grain for delivery in 1 year ever transacted.

Cuba was a direct beneficiary. Of the total 198 million bushels in the agreement, 16.5 million bushels of wheat and flour worth \$33 million are for delivery by the Soviet Union to Cuba.

The only transaction comparable in size is a \$580 million foreign aid sale of U.S. wheat to India. That agreement, to expire June 30, 1964, covered a 3-year period.

The agreement, the third between the two countries, calls for deliveries five times as large as those provided for under any previous agreement with the Soviet Union. The Soviet purchase is also larger by about 40 million bushels than the recent long-term purchase by Communist China of 187 million bushels.

UNITED STATES INFORMED

Mitchell Sharp, Minister of Trade and Commerce, who negotiated the agreement for Canada, said the United States had been informed that part of the wheat was to be delivered to Cuba and had offered no objections. The Soviet Union will be responsible for transporting the wheat, he said.

Recently, the Ontario Wheat-Marketing Board, acting on its own, sold 1.8 million bushels of wheat to a foreign buyer and it was reported that it was destined for Cuba. Canada has been selling skimmed-milk powder to Cuba directly for some time.

Under the terms of the agreement signed today, Canada will deliver at its ports 6.3 million long tons or 198 million bushels of wheat and 575 long tons or 29.5 million bushels of wheat flour by July 1964. From the ports, the Soviet Union has the responsibility of transporting the grain.

The agreement was signed by Mr. Sharp, and S. A. Borisov, Soviet First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, who has been here as head of a Soviet trade delegation for the last 2 weeks to negotiate the purchase.

The agreement provides for short-term, Government-guaranteed credit through July 1964. The Soviet Union has agreed to buy 500,000 long tons or 18.7 million bushels more wheat or flour in 1965. This would be worth about \$36 million, a relatively small amount, which it was said might be increased if the Soviet Union needs to supplement its own crop further.

It is understood that the Soviet Union is acting as an intermediary for Cuba because Havana lacks the dollars to buy wheat directly. The Soviet Union is understood to have accrued the necessary dollars through recent gold sales. Mr. Sharp noted that Canada insists on payment in dollars.

VOLUME SURPRISING

What is most surprising about the agreement is the volume of deliveries. Fulfillment of the commitment within a year will pose serious logistical problems, tax the capacity of Canadian flour mills and lower the reserve in Canadian granaries to about the safety level of less than 500,000 bushels.

Mr. Sharp said at a news conference that the agreement, coming after Canada's sale this summer of 187 million bushels of wheat to Communist China over a 3-year period, would not interfere with commitments to supply major markets in Britain, Europe, Japan, Asia and elsewhere under the International Wheat Agreement.

It might, however, prevent Canada from carrying out her planned expansion of foreign aid to underdeveloped countries in the form of gifts of grain.

Canada, Mr. Sharp said, will not try to sell any more wheat this year. However, it is reported that a Polish delegation is coming to try to make additional purchase. Poland has bought Canadian wheat for several years.

Mr. Sharp said the Soviet delegation had made no secret of its intention to distribute some of the huge grain purchase among its satellites in Eastern Europe as well as in Cuba.

Mr. Borisov said in a statement, read in Russian and translated, that weather in the Soviet Union had adversely affected the Soviet wheat crop, forcing his country to buy from other countries. The Soviet Govern-

ment has also bought substantial quantities of wheat from Australia.

Future purchases of wheat from Canada for delivery to Soviet ports near Canada could be "economically justified and proper," Mr. Borisov said. He declared that this would "depend on how much Canada is able to enlarge its purchases of Soviet goods." Because the economies of Canada and the Soviet Union are somewhat similar, any great expansion of Russian exports to this country is regarded as unlikely.

The wheat sale was made possible by the Export Credit Insurance Corporation, a Government body, which agreed to provide guarantees to a maximum of \$200 million at any one time. The sale was for 25 percent cash for each shipment, with one-third of the balance payable after 6, 12 and 18 months from the date of shipment.

The agreement is expected to set a record for wheat export in a single year. The Canadian Wheat Board, whose chairman, W. C. McNamara, took part in the negotiations, estimated that total exports this year would amount to 550-million bushels, against 366-million bushels in 1952-53, the best postwar year. Sales of 550-million bushels would represent foreign-exchange earnings of more than \$1 billion.

Wheat sales to Communist China and the Soviet Union will go a long way toward enabling Canada to cover its chronic imbalance of trade with the United States, running at the rate of about \$1 billion a year.

The wheat and flour purchased by the Soviet Union for delivery this year, including purchases outside the agreement, amount to 239 million bushels.

Because of the immense volume of grain movements to the ports in so short a time, N. R. Crump and Donald Gordon, presidents of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways, were consulted on the ability of their lines to handle the traffic. They expressed confidence that they could do so, although it would mean doubling the traffic.

Arrangements have been made, Mr. Sharp said, to speed the movement of grain carriers through the St. Lawrence Seaway for the time left in the ice-free season and from the time it reopens next spring.

Even if Canada is able to get the required amount of grain from the prairies to the ports on her east and west coasts, it was suggested that the Soviet Union might find trouble in getting ships to carry the cargoes to its own ports.

HARVEST FAILURE FORCES BUYING

Moscow, September 18.—Disappointing grain harvests and widespread waste of bread in the Soviet Union apparently forced the Kremlin to make its huge purchase of wheat from Canada today. The trade agreement comes after what amounted to a form of bread rationing in the Soviet Union.

CHARGES AGAINST OTTO F. OTEPKA, STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICE OF SECURITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I was not pleased to read in the September 27 issue of the Washington Evening Star an article entitled "Storm Brews on Charges Facing State Security Aid"; in the Des Moines Register of the same date an article entitled "Seek To Oust Official Who Defied 'Gag'"; and in the September 29 issue of the Washington Evening Star an article entitled "Don't Talk to Senators, Officers at State Told."

The sum and substance of these articles is that a State Department official

by the name of Otto F. Otepka, a 48-year-old lawyer and long-time official of the State Department, apparently has been ousted because of what is alleged to have been a breach of the security regulations in the State Department. The articles indicate that the case is not quite as simple as the allegations would seem to make it.

The problem arises over an effort on the part of one of the committees of the U.S. Senate to obtain from the State Department information deemed vital to our security interests and the cooperation of Mr. Otepka with the committee and the lack of cooperation and resistance on the part of some of his colleagues in the office concerned.

I understand that continued efforts will be made by the committee of the Senate to obtain all information necessary to discharge its responsibilities. I trust that efforts will also be made to see to it that officials who have reprimanded and ousted Mr. Otepka, who sought to cooperate with the committee of the Senate, are appropriately disciplined.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 27, 1963]

STORM BREWS ON CHARGES FACING STATE SECURITY AID

A storm seems to be brewing over administrative charges filed against Otto F. Otepka, Chief of the Division of Evaluation in the State Department's Office of Security.

A department spokesman said the 48-year-old Otepka had until October 3 to reply to charges which could lead to his discharge. He refused to say what the charges are.

Robert Morris, former chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, said in Dallas last night that he had heard that the essence of the charges is that Mr. Otepka collaborated with the present chief counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee, J. G. Sourwine.

WON'T HOLD WATER

Mr. Sourwine said that if that is the basis "then the charge won't hold water."

Mr. Morris said he had heard that Mr. Otepka had been accused of disclosing secret information to the Senate.

Mr. Morris said the charges brought against Mr. Otepka "include giving 'Confidential' and 'For Official Use Only' information to the chief counsel. Both of these classifications are relatively low and in fact were inserted on the information by Mr. Otepka himself."

Early in the year, Mr. Otepka and other State Department security officers testified before the subcommittee during an investigation of William A. Wieland, a career diplomat and desk officer on Cuban affairs during Fidel Castro's rise to power.

Mr. Morris called the charges "a travesty of justice."

"If Mr. Otepka collaborated with Sourwine, he collaborated with the U.S. Senate itself," he said. "This should not be considered a crime."

Mr. Morris said that "Mr. Otepka's burn-basket was ransacked, his desk searched, and he himself subjected to extensive investigation. Thus today's offense seems to be collaboration not with Communists but with dutiful security officers who are trying to

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17771

keep their appointed rounds in traditional fashion."

Mr. Morris now is president of the Defenders of American Liberty, a Dallas-based organization.

REFLECT DIRECTION

He said the charges against Mr. Otepka "reflect the direction in which our Nation is moving today in the face of growing Soviet power * * *. For being reasonably cooperative with this sacred arm of Congress, he (Mr. Otepka) is now up on charges that could lead to his dismissal from service."

Senator EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the subcommittee, said the group would look into the situation.

Senator KEATING, Republican, of New York, a subcommittee member, said he didn't know what the charges were but would think the subcommittee would like to find out.

"If he's charged with misuse of documents affecting the security of our country, that's one thing," Senator KEATING said. "But if it involves documents that reflect on other officials of the Department, that's another thing."

"If it is the latter, the committee would certainly want to look into it further. But I don't know."

GIVEN TWO SPECIAL JOBS

Mr. Phillips said Mr. Otepka remains chief of the division of evaluation in the Office of Security, but since June 27 has been detailed to two special projects. These are updating of the Office of Security Handbook and preparation of guidelines for the security evaluation of personnel.

State Department officials said that there is no question of a conflict existing between the State Department and congressional committees in testimony given in response to committee questions.

There were indications, however, that the Department considered the volunteering of unauthorized information to congressional investigators to be a breach of the right of executive privilege that amounts to insubordination.

Under executive privilege, a Federal agency can withhold certain information from Congress if it feels that the disclosure of such information would hamper the executive from carrying out his duties.

In refusing to make public the charges against Mr. Otepka, the State Department said this is considered a personal action between an employer and an employee.

The employee has a right not to be tried in public by press release unless he chooses to make public the charges against him himself, the Department said.

[From the Des Moines Register, Sept. 27, 1963]

SEEK TO OUST OFFICIAL WHO DEFIED GAG

WASHINGTON, D.C.—State Department officials are seeking to oust a top security investigator for producing documents for a congressional committee that is said to contradict testimony of three high State Department officials.

Otto F. Otepka, a 48-year-old lawyer, has been served with a notice of charges that he provided State Department information to unauthorized persons. He was chief of the evaluation division of the State Department security section.

It is contended that Otepka produced the State Department records for Jay Sourwine, chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Committee, in violation of State Department policy to refuse to produce such records.

SERIES OF JOBS

Otepka, a native of Chicago, Ill., has been Government employee since 1936. He has served in the Agriculture Department and the Internal Revenue Service, and was an employee of the Civil Service Commission before being moved to the State Department

in 1953 under the Eisenhower administration to be an assistant chief in the evaluation division of the security program.

In 1958, Otepka received the State Department's Meritorious Service Award.

He is reported to have been at odds with some of his superiors in the Kennedy administration over decisions to clear persons he regarded as having questionable records.

CONTRADICTORY DATA

The Senate Internal Security Committee questioned Otepka on a number of cases, including that of an Assistant Secretary of State.

Asked if he had documentary evidence to support his testimony, he said he did.

Later, several of Otepka's superiors were questioned on the same cases. They gave testimony that was said to contradict his.

Otepka, called again, produced documents which committee members said indicated some of his superiors had given inaccurate testimony.

TO NEW JOB

Although Otepka was allowed to retain his title as chief of the evaluation division and his \$16,965-a-year salary, on June 27 he was removed from his office and from access to his records.

He was given a "special project" job, which included the assembly of a Department handbook on security matters.

For several weeks the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has sought to question Secretary of State Dean Rusk, but he has been reported to be too busy with major international problems to appear.

In bringing the charges, the legal section of the State Department is relying upon an order drafted in 1948 by the Truman administration to bar a congressional committee from records of the security case of William Remington, who had been held to be a security risk.

The congressional committee sought to establish responsibility for the hiring and promotions of Remington, but the administration barred the inquiry.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 29, 1963]

DON'T TALK TO SENATORS, OFFICERS AT STATE TOLD

(By Earl H. Voss)

The State Department has forbidden its security officers and some other personnel to talk to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee or members of its staff without permission.

This has effectively cut off all contact with Congress by the Department's Security and Consular Affairs Division, officials say.

The threatened firing of security officer Otto Otepka on a charge of furnishing information to the U.S. Senate and its investigative bodies is believed to have precipitated the order.

TEXT OF MEMO

Abba P. Schwartz, administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the State Department, sent the following order to all bureau employees August 15:

"Subject: Appearance before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

"You are hereby instructed that henceforth all (all is underlined) personnel of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs are not to appear before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee unless the requested appearance has been cleared in advance with me personally or Mr. Mace (deputy administrator).

"This includes contact or interviews with any members of the staff of the subcommittee.

"Mr. Mace or I should be notified of any requested interview or appearance by the subcommittee or members of the staff."

John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary

of State for Security, issued similar instructions to members of his staff, including Mr. Otepka.

The order has been interpreted by most employees to mean that they should no longer maintain social contacts with Congressmen or members of their staff.

The instructions, some officials say, are contrary to title V, section 52, of the United States Code which states that the right of any member of the classified civil service to furnish information to any Member of Congress shall not be denied. This law was passed by Congress in 1948.

Congress, by concurrent resolutions of the House and Senate in 1958, declared that:

"Any person in Government service should put loyalty to highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department."

The congressional resolution is becoming the focus of the argument in the Otepka case. The State Department has instituted proceedings for his discharge.

KEEP SILENCE

State Department officials refuse to discuss the case. They are understood to charge him with passing the Senate information about possible security risks among Kennedy administration appointees.

Officials resentful of the new Schwartz order are complaining that they are being required to place "institutional loyalty," meaning loyalty to State Department leaders, above other loyalties.

Mr. Otepka has been notified he has until Thursday to answer the charge that he furnished information to the U.S. Senate contrary to an Executive order issued in 1948 by President Truman.

The order provided that records on the loyalty of Government employees should be kept in confidence in the executive branch.

CONFLICTING RESOLUTION

The congressional resolution in 1958 encouraged employees of the executive branch to furnish information to Members of Congress.

The question now is whether a Government employee can be penalized for testifying under oath if his testimony contradicts policy of the administration in power.

Mr. Otepka is due to be suspended without pay October 23.

The Kennedy administration has been having its troubles with the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs since the administration came to power. There have been seven chiefs of the Bureau in the last 8 years.

President Kennedy's first appointee to the office, Salvatore Bontampo, of New Jersey, retired under fire because of opposition from the late Representative Francis Walter of Pennsylvania.

THE FATE OF MARXISM

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, Dr. Mary Benyamin, a member of the department of public law and government at Columbia University, has written an incisive article on the nature and potential of the Communist philosophy which is deserving of the attention of every Senator.

It is entitled "The Fate of Marxism," and was first printed, at the request of Costa Rica's President Figueres, in the fall 1962 issue of *Combate*. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the *Record* at the conclusion of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

October 3

17772

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Dr. Benjamin eloquently points out that the United States is not the country—in attitudes or in theory—that it was when Karl Marx produced his Manifesto. Nor do the terms "communism" and "capitalism" connote what they did a century ago. We must assume the task of keeping up to date on communism. We must see that the world is aware that communism in theory and communism in practice are two very different things. And we must understand the nuances of the Communist system as well as we understand our own republican pattern.

Mr. President, I suggest that Dr. Benjamin's article goes a long way toward illuminating this entire subject and I wholeheartedly recommend it to my colleagues.

Though I cannot say I agree with every paragraph in the article, it is interesting and enlightening, and surely provocative and challenging. It is good adult education.

EXHIBIT 1

THE FATE OF MARXISM

A faith may be mortal. It can die because it loses its followers or it can be killed by those who profess to be its followers. The latter fate has befallen Marxism. It was from the first a faith beset by contradictions and limitations. Conceived by a man of a dogmatic nature, who was embittered by the established order because of its social discriminations and its economic injustices, the Marxist faith promised the inauguration of a utopian society where oppression and exploitation would cease to exist. Marx professed to demonstrate that by the very nature of society and the inexorable laws of history, the doom of "capitalism," followed by the triumph of communism, was destined to happen. His creed was brought to the test in the sequel of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, and Marxism suffered the fate inherent in its own success. Its triumph became the proof of its unreality.

Yet its triumph has convulsed the 20th century. Under its banner communism holds one half of the irreconcilably divided world. Having consolidated Soviet Russia, it went on to win China and is sweeping onward through the Orient and into the islands of the Pacific. It works openly or under ground in all other lands. It is creeping into the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. It threatens the system of Western Europe.

Communist countries may go on to vaster strength, but never any more will they be animated by the faith of Marx. Communism may make new gains, as it has been making them since the Bolshevik Revolution. But the Communist movement is not Marxism. The movement goes on but the creed is dead. The goal envisaged by Marx is no longer its objective.

The revolutionary ardor that swept Marxist communism into power over giant Russia did not cool into the same kind of retreat and partial reversal that has characterized other ideological revolutions. When a great revolution subsides there is usually a period of reaction. But in Soviet Russia no new government replaced the revolutionary government. In the language of the Marxists there was no "Thermidor." What happened was not reaction from the Communist system but the maturation and revelation of the inherent character of the system itself. The revolutionary party did not lose political power—on the contrary, it continuously increased this power. It kept on proclaiming the tenets of the faith, but the doctrine it really held and the persuasive

strength it still possessed ceased to be Marxist except in name.

It is the object of this article to point out how the idealistic element in the Marxist creed, the vision of freedom, equality, and brotherhood, has been denuded of significance in the evolution of a system of state socialism.

First, let us briefly review the essential tenets of Marxism. It is a strange but fascinating ideology. At its birth there were sown, to use an expression of which Marx himself was fond, the seeds of its own decay—and doom.

Marx built up a system of socialism in which society moved "by dialectical necessity" to an inevitable consummation. He conceived the final outcome to be a society without class and without coercion, one in which men were awarded according to need and worked according to ability. The new system was "scientific," Marx said, because it obeyed immutable laws, and especially the "law," which Marx himself "discovered," of the inevitable decay and fall of "capitalism," when the "proletariat" took possession of political power and in turn prepared for its own abolition, to be followed by the classless and stateless society. The "law" was infallible and irresistible. It was not supported by any evidence but solely by a group of dogmas held by Marx to be eternal truths.

The underlying dogma was that "material" forces determined human history. Processes, relations, values, goals, every element within society, including modes of thought, were "rooted in the material conditions of life." This proposition in its fragmentary exposition was assumed to be self-evident. "Material" sometimes seemed to refer to "matter" in a philosophical sense; sometimes it seemed to mean "economic," sometimes "technological," sometimes "social," sometimes, more narrowly but not more clearly, it meant whatever determined the processes and forms of production. In any case, these forces would control history until society harnessed them, at which point man would gain his "spiritual" emancipation. His teacher Hegel had declared that "spirit" or "mind" determined the material world, Marx declared instead that the "material," or "social," environment determined the spiritual. In his introduction to the "Critique of Political Economy," Marx wrote: "It is not the consciousness of man that determines their existence but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness."

The second major dogma, expounded in "Das Kapital" and in other works, was that history is a continuous process in which an ascendant system generates an opposite system (thesis and antithesis), inevitably culminating in a higher unity (synthesis) that ends the whole progression. Marx borrowed this concept of continuously evolving processes—the dialectic system—from Hegel, but while Hegel's procession of stages culminated in the apotheosis of the world state, Marx's procession of stages ended in the disappearance of the state itself. He explained that at any given time some social order, with its privileged class and corresponding ideology and institutions, is dominant. At the same time the dialectical forces of change accumulate against it, to upturn it in the end—not just to modify it or gradually transform it but finally to overthrow it. This dialectical pattern continues throughout the course of history until it is finally resolved when the driving force, the class struggle, ends in the Communist Revolution with its abolition of class altogether. The followers of Marx have endlessly expounded his "dialectical materialism," but no exposition makes it any more clear—or any more true. History offers no simple, no universal pattern of change. Systems change and grow and merge and pass

in countless ways. The dogmatic mind postulates one way alone. The violent mind insists that it be revolutionary.

Having adapted the philosophical dialectic to the evolution of classes in precommunist societies, Marx devoted his special attention to the study of class conflict within the industrial society of capitalism—a doctrine embodied in the formidable "Communist Manifesto." He showed that the exploiting capitalist class (bourgeoisie) strive to keep the working class (proletariat) in subjection, living on the fruits of their toil and lulling them with an ideology, including a religion. The "proletariat" at length revolts and is predestinated to victory in the war of classes. The "dictatorship of the proletariat," which follows victory, would be merely a temporary instrument, constituting "the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a society without classes." It would crush all elements of the military-capitalistic system, socialize the means of production and make other structural changes. With the completion of the revolutionary transformation, the "dialectic" would cease eternally, since the clash between the proletarian and capitalist classes represents the final stage of social conflict.

The particular way in which the capitalistic system would be overthrown is through the operation of "surplus value." The price of labor power was the value of the necessities of life required to sustain the laborer, but labor produced more than it was necessary for the subsistence of the laborer, therefore more than his wage. The balance (surplus value) which was kept by the owner of the means of production, was the source of profits and wealth of the "parasitic" capitalist class. Because of the accretion of surplus value, the capitalist system establishes an accumulation of wealth in the hands of an ever decreasing number of capitalists, corresponding with an accumulation of misery among an ever increasing proletariat. The growing proletariat eventually becomes numerous enough to overturn the system and this is the revolution.

Here another major dogma came in. It was the particular contribution of Engels. To him and to Marx the state was nothing but a special apparatus of coercion and exploitation in the hands of the ruling class. It was a symbol of irreconcilable class antagonism generated in the presocialized economy; it was the most oppressive organ in the history of mankind. Naturally, then, when the proletariat emerged triumphant with its revolutionary goals achieved, there would no longer be a need for any such organ. According to the dogma, however, the state would not be abolished but would somehow, to use Engels' own expression, "cease of itself" or "wither away," wither out of history, and as it withered the classless society would come to its own, to abide forever.

Engels explains: "The proletariat seizes the state power and transforms the means of production in the first instance into state property. But in doing this, it puts an end to itself as the proletariat, it puts an end to all class differences and class antagonisms, it puts an end also to the state as the state As soon as there is no longer any class of society to be held in subjection; as soon as, along with class domination and the struggle for individual existence based on the former anarchy of production, the collisions and excesses arising from these have also been abolished, there is nothing more to be repressed, which would make a special repressive force, a state, necessary. The first act in which the state really comes forward as the representative of society as a whole—this taking possession of the means of production in the name of society—is at the same time its last independent act as a state. The interference of the state power in social relations becomes superfluous in